

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated June 13, 2005.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because of informalities. The specification has been corrected to avoid this objection.

Further, the Examiner has objected to claims 1-3 because of informalities. Moreover, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Furthermore, the Examiner has stated that claims 1-3 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action. Claims 1-3 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 4-6 which are rewritten from claims 1-3 to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

The applicant has reviewed the prior art as cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection and believes that the new claims clearly and distinctly patentably define over such prior art.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition of allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Signature

Leong C. Lei

Registration No. 50402

September 12, 2005